

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 23, 25-28 and 33, and 35-42 are active in this application.

The rejections under 35 USC 103(a) over the references of Farwick-1, Farwick-2, Farwick-3, Farwick-4, Farwick-5, Burke-1, Burke-2, Burke-3, Burke-4, Burke-5, Hans, Nampoothiri-i, Nampoothiri-2, Nampoothiri-3, Nampoothiri-4, Mockel-1, Mockel-2, Mockel-3, Dusch, Wehmeier, Dunican-i, Dunican-2, Dunican-3, Dunican-4, and Dunican-5 combined with the previously cited Kramer, Grabau, Chang and Chang are respectfully traversed because:

- (1) the subject matter of the cited patents and publications as well as the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned or subject to an obligation of assignment to Evonik, formally Degussa AG or
- (2) subject to a joint research agreement that was in effect on or before the date the claimed invention was made, the claimed invention was a result of that agreement, and the parties are so named.\

The inventors Farwick, Hans and Möckel were employees of Degussa, the others were external inventors bound by an agreement (Burke and Dunican: University of Ireland/ Nampoothiri: FZJülich GmbH / Dusch and Wehmeier: University of Bielefeld)

Burke-1 corresponds to Burke-5

Burke-1, -2 and -4 are co-owned with FZJülich GmbH and University of Ireland

Burke-3 is co-owned with University of Ireland

Dunican-1, -4 and -5 are co-owned with FZJülich GmbH and University of Ireland

Dunican-2 and -3 are co-owned with University of Ireland

Reconsideration and Withdrawal of the rejections is requested

To the rejections under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting (provisional or otherwise):

A terminal Disclaimer is attached for the rejection citing to U.S. 7,319,026

To the still co-pending 10/794,417; 10/483,413; 10/812,315; and 11/350,043,  
Applicants request that these rejections be held in abeyance since the alleged conflicting claims have not yet been patented. Further, Applicants note the following from MPEP § 822.01:


The "provisional" double patenting rejection should continue to be made by the examiner in each application as long as there are conflicting claims in more than one application unless that "provisional" double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in one of the applications. If the "provisional" double patenting rejection in one application is the only rejection remaining in that application, the examiner should then withdraw that rejection and permit the application to issue as a patent, thereby converting the "provisional" double patenting rejection in the other application(s) into a double patenting rejection at the time the one application issues as a patent.

Indeed, as apparent with respect to many of the earlier cited co-pending applications, claims change during prosecution and therefore the present application should be allowed to issue.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any aspect of this application, he is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman E. Oblon



---

Daniel J. Pereira, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,518

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)